```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                       EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
 2
                              SOUTHERN DIVISION
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                       Plaintiff,
                                        Case No. 18-20027
 5
     VS.
                                        Hon. Terrence G. Berg
 6
     PRABHU RAMAMOORTHY,
 7
                       Defendant.
 8
                                SENTENCING
 9
                  BEFORE THE HONORABLE TERRENCE G. BERG
                        United States District Judge
10
                  Theodore Levin United States Courthouse
                        231 West Lafayette Boulevard
11
                         Detroit, Michigan 48226
                        Thursday, December 13, 2018
12
     APPEARANCES:
13
     For the Plaintiff
14
                                 MARGARET M. SMITH
     United States of America:
                                  AMANDA JAWAD
                                  U.S. Attorney's Office
15
                                  211 W. Fort Street
                                  Suite 2001
16
                                  Detroit, Michigan 48226
                                  313-226-9135
17
     For the Defendant
                                  JAMES AMBERG
18
                                 Amberg and Amberg
     Prabhu Ramamoorthy:
19
                                  104 W. Fourth Street
                                  Suite 305
                                  Royal Oak, Michigan 48070
20
                                  248-681-0115
21
     Also Present:
                                  Rengachari Vijayaraghavan
22
                                  Court Interpreter
23
         To obtain a certified copy of this transcript, contact:
              Linda M. Cavanagh, CSR-0131, RDR, RMR, CRR, CRC
2.4
                          Official Court Reporter
                 (313) 234-2616 • www.transcriptorders.com
25
```

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	<u>Page</u>
3	SENTENCING:
4	Allocution by Mr. Amberg
5	Allocution by Mr. Amberg
6	Sentence of the Court43
7	EXHIBITS
8	Identification Offered Received
9	NONE STITE OF THE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
Detroit, Michigan
 1
 2
               Thursday, December 13, 2018
 3
               (Proceedings commenced at 1:17 p.m., all parties
 4
 5
              present)
                          The Court now calls Case No. 18-20067,
 6
              THE CLERK:
     the United States of America versus Prabhu Ramamoorthy.
 7
              Counsel, please place your appearances on the record.
 8
 9
              MS. JAWAD: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Amanda Jawad
     and Maggie Smith on behalf of the United States, and with us at
10
11
     counsel table is Special Agent Kyle Dodge with the FBI.
12
              THE COURT: Good afternoon.
              MR. AMBERG: And good afternoon, Your Honor.
13
                                                             It's
14
     good to see you. Jim Amberg on behalf of the defendant who is
     sitting to my right, and to his right is the interpreter, Mr.
15
16
     Vijay, who we know. Mr. Mansour had a conflict and could not
     make it here today.
17
18
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Good
     afternoon, Mr. Amberg. Good afternoon, Mr. Ramamoorthy.
19
              Before we get started, I do want to just indicate we
20
21
     were delayed yesterday because of your failure to appear, sir,
     so I just want to make sure that you understand how serious
22
23
     that is and it's not appropriate and it's not the kind of
     service that we expect from our interpreters. Do you
24
     understand?
25
```

THE INTERPRETER: 2 THE COURT: All right. Let's make sure that that

Yes.

doesn't happen again. 3

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, this is the date we have set for the sentencing in this case, and I understand there's an issue regarding a comfort canine or something to that effect. Would someone like to address that?

MS. JAWAD: Yes, Your Honor. The government previously agreed that the canine advocate would be in the hallway because Mr. Mansour is highly allergic, but since he's not here today, we would like to request that the canine be allowed to sit in the courtroom with Laura. The canine has provided a significant amount of comfort to her both yesterday and today, and I think it would be -- help ease her anxiety in being here today and confronting the defendant if she were permitted to sit with the dog.

THE COURT: All right. What's the position of the defense, Mr. Amberg?

MR. AMBERG: Your Honor, thank you. The only real issue that I think we have is I don't want the comfort canine to become a distraction while the sentencing is going on. I sort of have thoughts about -- you know, like I don't want to put Laura in a position where she feels less comfortable because this -- the dog is not up here. I would say just leave the dog in the hallway. I know that's what we were going to do

```
yesterday when Mr. Mansour was here. I would ask the dog just
 1
     stay in the hallway I guess.
 2
              THE COURT: Any response?
 3
              MS. JAWAD: Yes, Your Honor. We're not asking to
 4
 5
     bring the dog up with Laura, just that the dog be able to sit
     next to her. And I noticed a very big difference in her
 6
     demeanor yesterday between before the dog arrived and after the
 7
 8
     dog arrived. She is fairly anxious and has a lot of anxiety
 9
     about what is happening today, and I -- I do think the dog --
     it may seem trivial, but I actually think that having the
10
11
     comfort of the canine next to her has calmed Laura and I've
12
     seen the difference between what her demeanor was like before
     and after. And I don't think that a dog sitting in the
13
14
     audience portion of the courtroom will provide any type of
15
     distraction to the proceedings. And there is precedent for
16
     this. Just last week Judge Murphy had a sentencing where there
     was a canine advocate present, and the canine, the same dog,
17
18
     sat in the courtroom and there were no issues with that.
              THE COURT: And Ms. Laura is present in the
19
20
     courtroom, is that right?
21
              MS. JAWAD: That's correct, Your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: All right. And would it be helpful to
23
     you to have the dog present, ma'am?
24
              THE WITNESS: Yes, it would. Thank you.
              THE COURT: All right. Why don't you bring in the
25
```

```
dog and the dog can sit nearby but not...
 1
 2
              MS. JAWAD:
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
              THE COURT:
                          I think everyone understands that the dog
 3
     should not be a distraction in any way and no one's attempting
 4
     to make the dog a distraction. That's an understandable
 5
               But at the same time, if such a procedure makes
 6
     the -- the stress of this type of a proceeding easier, then we
 7
 8
     can try to accommodate that.
 9
              So Mr. Ramamoorthy, we're going to have a hearing to
     determine what your sentence should be in this case, and I want
10
11
     to make sure that you understand what's going to happen.
                         Your Honor, I'm sorry. Before we begin,
12
              MS. JAWAD:
     has the interpreter been sworn?
13
              THE COURT: No, I don't think he has, so why don't we
14
     go ahead and do that. So, sir, would you raise your right
15
     hand?
16
            RENGACHARI VIJAYARAGHAVAN
17
18
     was thereupon called as an interpreter herein, and after being
     first duly sworn to translate from English to Tamil and from
19
     Tamil to English to the best of their ability, translated as
20
     follows:
21
22
              THE INTERPRETER: Yes.
23
              THE COURT: All right. You may be seated, and please
     proceed with the interpretation of these proceedings.
24
              So I'm going to explain what's going to happen.
25
                                                               So
```

Mr. Ramamoorthy, we are having a hearing on what your sentence should be. We're going to go over the Pre-Sentence Report.

There was a Pre-Sentence Report that was prepared. I want to make certain that you've seen it and that you've gone over it with your lawyer. So I'll ask you some questions about it, and then I'll also ask your lawyer whether he has any objections to it. I'll also ask the government counsel if they've reviewed it and whether they have any objections to it.

Then we need to make certain that you understand what the guidelines are that apply in your case. The Pre-Sentence Report contains a calculation of those guidelines and we'll go over that calculation with you. I'll make a determination as to what the guideline range is in this case and then you'll have an understanding of what those guidelines are.

I'll also go over with you what the different factors are that the Court has to consider in determining what the sentence should be because there's a federal statute or law that requires the Court to take certain things into account at the time of sentencing, and I'll go over all those things with you to make sure you understand that.

I'm going to give your attorney an opportunity to speak on your behalf and Mr. Amberg will do so. He has also provided to the Court a detailed sentencing memorandum or a legal brief that contains a number of arguments on your behalf as to what the sentence should be. And then I've also received

```
a similar brief like that from the government and I've reviewed
 1
 2
     that.
              After your attorney has an opportunity to speak, I'll
 3
     give you an opportunity to say whatever you would like to say
 4
     on your own behalf. I'd be happy to hear from you.
 5
              And then I will also ask the government to address
 6
 7
     the Court, and at that point the government attorney will go
 8
     over what she believes the proper sentence should be in the
 9
     case.
              After we've gone through all of that, I'm going to go
10
     over the different factors that I do have to consider in
11
     determining what the sentence should be, and I'll explain how I
12
     think those factors apply in this case. And then after I've
13
14
     done that, I will indicate what the sentence will be.
15
              Do you think you understand what's going to happen?
16
              THE INTERPRETER: Yes, he understands.
              THE COURT: All right. Well, why don't you come up
17
     to the lectern here with your attorney please.
18
                          Your Honor, would you like me at this
19
              MS. JAWAD:
     lectern or at the table?
20
21
                           That's fine, if you -- you could go to
               THE COURT:
     that lectern if you would.
22
23
               So let me just ask Mr. Amberg, did you have a chance
     to go over the Pre-Sentence Report?
24
```

MR. AMBERG: I have, Your Honor, I went over it,

25

```
which is evidenced by my sentencing memorandum. I also went over it with Mr. Ramamoorthy. I visited with him a number of times at Milan to go over it. We made some, not any major, changes, but just some additions I suppose, and contacted the Probation Department. But really there wasn't anything too different from what's — what was in the original report, just — just some additions to it. But we went over it at great length.
```

I've discussed his guideline scoring that was in the Pre-Sentence Investigation Report. I don't think that there's a disagreement as to what the guidelines are. We've discussed how that guideline was computed together to get that result.

I gave him a copy of the Pre-Sentence Investigation Report. I've also given him a copy of my memorandum that I wrote as well as the government's memorandum that they responded with as well. So he's had all that.

I saw Mr. Ramamoorthy two days ago to sort of go through final prep of the sentencing at Milian and, you know, we discussed what was going to happen again today, so hopefully he feels comfortable with what's going to happen here. I believe I've done everything I can to explain the circumstances and the situation to him.

I know we have an interpreter here. I want to make sure he understands everything, and so I would ask that if he has any questions -- Prabhu, if you have any questions, please

```
1
     let me know and also ask Mr. Vijay as well.
 2
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. So you
     don't have any objections to the Pre-Sentence Report then?
 3
              MR. AMBERG: None, Your Honor.
 4
                           Okay. And let me ask then Ms. Russo
 5
              THE COURT:
     [sic], do you have any objections to the Pre-Sentence Report?
 6
                          No objection, Your Honor.
 7
              MS. JAWAD:
               THE COURT: All right. Well, I did go over the
 8
 9
     Pre-Sentence Report as well.
              And so Mr. Ramamoorthy, you know, of course, that you
10
11
     were charged in this case with a federal crime, and in
     particular that crime was Criminal Sexual Conduct. It was a --
12
     it is a violation of Title 18 U.S. Code, Section 2242(2). And
13
14
     that a jury trial was held in this case and that you were found
15
     quilty by the jury of this offense.
              And the -- the offense under the Federal Sentencing
16
     Guidelines has certain offense levels that are associated with
17
     it, and for this offense, the guidelines start off with a Base
18
     Offense Level of 30, and that's what the probation officer
19
     determined here, that the guideline of Section 2A3.1 applied in
20
21
     this case. And I've reviewed the sentencing quidelines and I
     agree that the Base Offense Level is 30 in this case.
22
23
              Now, the Pre-Sentence Report also included what they
     call a victim-related adjustment and that is a two-point
24
25
     addition to the Base Offense Level, and that applies if you
```

have a situation where the victim was someone who would be considered a vulnerable victim. And a vulnerable victim is defined in the sentencing guidelines and it includes situations where a person is unable to resist, for example, the activities of the defendant. And in this case it was determined by the probation officer that this was applicable, these two points. That's what Section 3A1.1(b)1 provides for. And so in this case your Base Offense Level started at 30 and then you had an additional two points added.

And the guidelines, just so you know, does define vulnerable victim as "a person who is a victim of the offense for which the defendant is accountable under the relevant conduct rules, who is unusually vulnerable due to age, physical or mental condition, or is otherwise particularly susceptible to the criminal conduct."

And so the Probation Department did assess you those two extra points, and both parties in this case are not objecting to those two points.

I might indicate that there — there is some case law that also supports the application of those two points. In particular, it's an Eighth Circuit case that's called *United States vs. Shoenborn*, and that's S-h-o-e-n-b-o-r-n, and that was a case where the court specifically addressed whether or not in a case involving a violation of this particular statute, whether this extra two points would apply. And in that case,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
which can be found at 793 F.3d 964, that's a 2015 Eighth
Circuit case, the court found that these two points did apply.
The reason for the challenge in that case had to do with
whether or not it would be considered some kind of double
counting because the offense in this case itself includes the
element that the victim in some ways is a vulnerable victim.
Now, the court in that Eighth Circuit case indicated that the
two points did apply.
         But I did want to just make it clear that the statute
in this case, that is, Section 2242(2), which is Sexual Abuse,
includes showing that the person who is the victim is either
"incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct," and that's
in 2242(2)(A), or the person is "physically incapable of
declining participation in, or communicating unwillingness to
engage in, the sexual act," and that's in 2242(2)(B). Now, as
I said, the Eighth Circuit indicated that those two points were
still applicable here.
         So the quideline range in this case, if we use the
Base Offense Level of 32, would result in a quideline range of
121 to 151 months. That's the guideline range that the
Probation Department determined.
         And I'm going through this so that it's all clear to
everyone what the guideline range is according to the Probation
Department in the Pre-Sentence Report. So let me just ask
counsel, does everyone agree that that is the quideline range?
```

```
MS. JAWAD:
                           Yes, Your Honor.
 1
 2
              MR. AMBERG: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. So that's the
 3
     quideline range that's in the Pre-Sentence Report. And as
 4
     there are no objections to that, I will accept the Pre-Sentence
 5
     Report and accept that as the relevant sentencing quideline
 6
 7
     range.
 8
               I should add that the quideline range is an important
 9
     factor that the Court has to consider, but it is not mandatory
     in the sense that the Court is not required to sentence someone
10
     to a sentence within that guideline range. The Court must
11
12
     sentence a person to a range and a -- a sentence that is
     sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish all the
13
14
     goals of sentencing. That's what the Court must do, that is
15
     mandatory on the Court. But the quideline range is one of
16
     those factors that the Court must consider in determining what
     the sentence is, and I'll go over those other factors with you
17
     as well.
18
              Do you think you understand everything that's
19
20
     happened so far there, Mr. Ramamoorthy?
21
              THE INTERPRETER: I might have a question on that.
22
              THE COURT: I'm sorry?
23
              MR. AMBERG: Does he understand everything, can you
2.4
     ask him?
               (Brief pause)
25
```

DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. So as far as the factors that the Court has to consider, let me go over those with you. I have to consider a number of factors under a particular federal law, and that's called Title 18 U.S. Code, Section 3553(a). And so I have to consider the nature and circumstances of the offense, in other words, what kind of offense is it, what happened.

I also have to consider the history and characteristics of the individual person, in other words, your background, your history, things that you've done up until now, your family situation, for example.

I also have to consider the need to have a sentence reflect the seriousness of the offense and also promote respect for law, provide for just punishment, protect the public, afford what we call adequate deterrence, and that means discouraging people from committing crimes, and also to provide for whatever necessary education or medical treatment or psychiatric treatment that a person might need.

And I also need to avoid what they call unwarranted sentencing disparities. That means treating people differently when their underlying crimes and their underlying backgrounds are really the same. So we try to avoid those kinds of unwarranted sentencing disparities.

So those are all the different factors that the Court does have to take into account in determining what the sentence

```
should be, and those are the factors that I will take into
 1
 2
     account.
              And as well, I might mention that it's helpful to the
 3
     Court if the attorneys address those factors because, as I
 4
 5
     said, those are the factors the Court must consider.
               So at this point I'd like to ask Mr. Amberg to go
 6
 7
     ahead and address the Court on your behalf.
 8
              MR. AMBERG:
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
 9
              And Prabhu, do you understand?
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yeah.
10
11
              MR. AMBERG: Your Honor, thank you.
               I did provide a detailed sentencing memorandum that
12
     went through the factors. I'm going to just touch on a few of
13
14
     them, but I'm not going to repeat everything I already said in
     the memorandum if that's okay with the Court. I see a few key
15
16
     issues here in the sentencing that I would ask the Court to
     look at in the determination of what to sentence Mr.
17
18
     Ramamoorthy to.
              The first thing that I -- I wanted to talk about was
19
     the -- the collateral effects of what's going to happen to him
20
21
     and what's already happened to him, and it's not just with him
     but it's with his family as well. I'm the first person to
22
23
     agree that there's always going to be some sort of
     collateral -- collateral consequence of a sentencing.
24
     Somebody's incarcerated, it's going to put a hardship on the
25
```

family, it's going to put a hardship on the person who's incarcerated. But as I provided some case law to the Court, there are times when that collateral consequence might be more exceptional than in a normal sentencing, and I believe that's here.

Mr. Ramamoorthy's wife is in the courtroom today.

After his conviction, he was no longer -- my understanding with Immigration, he was no longer allowed to be here under his visa and that he will ultimately be deported at the end of his incarceration portion of his sentence. Because of that, his wife had to leave the country. As you recall, Your Honor, Mr. Ramamoorthy and his wife legally came to the United States for work, and she was under his visa which allowed her to stay, and even though she had a job here, the consequence of his conviction affected her.

Now, the culture that Mr. Ramamoorthy and his wife and his family are a part of is something that I think is different than what we're used to in America. They're from southern India. And from conversations that I've had with the family, with Mr. Ramamoorthy, with his wife, with the doctor who provided the letter to the Court, it's my understanding that in this situation there will be a lifetime negative effect for Mr. Ramamoorthy and the rest of his family. The -- the closest I could come to explaining it was in my memorandum where I discussed shunning. And it appears to me that even now

when -- when his wife goes back to India, her future is now tied in to this case and to this verdict, and so that means a shunning from friends, from other family. Her life prospects go down. His mother and father suffer that as well. They are from a small village with about a hundred families out in India. Even if they have children eventually, if that happens, even they will be a product of that. And so I don't think we're used to seeing that here. I've never seen that before in a case. But that consequence is a severe and lifelong consequence that's in addition and unusual to what most people go through when they're incarcerated.

Along those lines, this idea of deportation and loss of career and loss of livelihood and things like that, I understand that that comes with being incarcerated. In this situation it's a little different than maybe what we're used to seeing where you have somebody who is illegally here in the first place. But Mr. Ramamoorthy, I mean his life is effectively over. He's no longer allowed to stay in the United States, he'll be deported immediately. As you can see from the Pre-Sentence Investigation Report, I mean he worked his life to come to America. So that's a consequence. His career is over. From talking with him, my understanding, that the realities of him finding a job in India are going to be limited based on what's happened here.

So when we look at these consequences, both these

```
cultural collateral consequences, the -- the economic collateral consequences, I would argue that they are more severe than normal. And because of that, maybe a downward departure from the guidelines might be appropriate, and I did provide some case law to that effect.
```

Another thing I discussed, and this is sort of on to the -- to put Mr. Ramamoorthy in -- in a better light, as you can see all the letters that were provided to the Court -- I apologize that some of those letters came in late -- but as you can read, you -- when you read these letters, you're reading about somebody that's fundamentally different from what we heard about in court.

And I know that from speaking with -- you know, like, for example, in the courtroom today we have some people that are here: his wife is here, his brother is here, a family friend is here. Even Mr. Vijay knows Mr. Ramamoorthy from outside of this. Mr. Ramamoorthy before this situation was involved in his temple very much on the -- the track up and trusted by the elders in the temple. He had no prior criminal history at all, no evidence that anything like this had ever happened before. I did provide both in the original bond motion back, you know, months and months ago as well as in this memorandum a certificate from the consulate from India reflecting that he had no criminal history in India.

I would argue that I -- I understand that we -- we

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
had a trial and he was convicted, but it appears it was an
isolated incident, and that since he was on bond, I don't
believe there was any issues. I know there might have been
something in the beginning, but we were able to resolve that,
but nothing serious.
         Another issue I thought was important in this case,
and it's something that I think about with clients who are
dealing with being incarcerated, is the victimization in
prison. And I did provide a case that discussed the situation
when officers go to prison and that their potential for
victimization might be greater, and that I think that we may
have that here.
         Since he's been incarcerated, Mr. Ramamoorthy has had
a what I would consider to be a more difficult time than a
normal inmate would. And again I'm going to preface that with
the understanding that prison is not a good experience at all,
but at the same time, prison shouldn't be more cruel than it
should have to be. And my understanding is that since he's
been in prison, he's been assaulted, he's had his things
stolen --
         THE COURT:
                     What happened with respect to this
assault?
         MR. AMBERG: He was slapped by another inmate.
         THE COURT: When did that occur and where did it
occur?
```

```
MR. AMBERG: It occurred in Milan and it occurred --
 1
     was it two months ago? October. You made a complaint?
 2
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yeah.
 3
              MR. AMBERG: He apparently made a complaint to the --
 4
 5
     to the -- the quards. Oh, to the warden?
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Warden and prison counselors.
 6
 7
              MR. AMBERG: And his counselor; don't know if you
     heard that, Your Honor. But he made a complaint to the warden
 8
 9
     and the counselor about what had happened. I know that he was
     a -- an inmate. I don't know if he knows who or whatever, but
10
11
     somebody stole some of his things and that that also -- did
12
     that happen around that time?
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yeah, somewhere around two
13
14
     weeks back.
15
              MR. AMBERG: Okay. So that happened?
16
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yeah.
              MR. AMBERG: And you -- and apparently he filed a
17
18
     complaint for that as well.
              His -- his sort of living situation right now, my
19
     understanding is that he feels pressured to convert religions,
20
21
     which I think is unusual but I think that's a fair thing to
22
     say, right?
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yeah.
23
              MR. AMBERG: I think that he may eventually have to
24
25
     do that for protection. He's basically alone in there. You
```

```
have somebody from India who's a -- not a citizen of the United States, who has no gang affiliations, no -- no other types of ties that I think would bond him to other inmates to -- to help him through this process, and so I -- I'm very concerned about his future in prison. I don't know if he'll be able to survive. And I do think, Your Honor, that is a reason that you could depart below the guidelines because of that and what we've already seen and what I think he'll probably experience as he goes forward no matter where he ends up.
```

I also wanted to talk about the case itself. I don't want to go into the facts or any arguments about what happened; those days have passed. But I do want to talk about the nature of this conviction. This conviction encompasses a lot more than the completed crime and includes attempt as part of that crime. And when -- if you'll recall, Your Honor, during the jury deliberations the jury actually came back with a note that discussed this idea of attempt. I can't remember exactly what it said, but it looked like maybe -- and I don't want to read into the tea leaves here, but maybe the jury, some of the jurors couldn't decide between attempt and the fully committed crime, but ultimately Your Honor let the jury know it doesn't matter, the crime is the crime.

THE COURT: And that was based on the jury instructions that counsel and the Court believed were appropriate, correct?

MR. AMBERG: And I agree, Your Honor. And my argument isn't that -- my argument is that when you look at the case and you look at this offense and you look at the conviction, I would ask that you look at it through the lens that this was an attempt. I understand, and as I put in my memorandum, the attempt is no different than the completed crime, but I do believe that the Court can look at a conviction and -- and look at what was proven. The facts of this case, you know, the confession, like I put in my memorandum, the confession appeared to be for an attempt. The -- the physical evidence suggested maybe it was an attempt. And so I would ask that when Your Honor contemplates the -- the 3553(a) factors when it discusses the nature of the offense, that you look at that as well.

I wanted to come in and argue the differences between state and federal sentencing but I can't. There's a case that stopped me from doing that.

But I do -- I do want to make that argument that I do believe that in this situation, a below guideline sentence would be appropriate. If Your Honor asked, "Well, Mr. Amberg what do you think would be the appropriate sentence?," he's already been in custody now for I believe seven months, six or seven months, give or take. He was originally incarcerated, then he was released on bond per our motion, and then after the conviction put back into custody. Custody became much worse

after that because of the conviction.

When you look at these factors and -- and you talk about rehabilitation, you talk about sending signals to the rest of the community as well as to Mr. Ramamoorthy about continuing this type of abhorrent behavior, I don't know what ten years in prison does, I don't know how that meets these goals.

The second that he is done with his prison sentence, he is out of this country within a matter of weeks. He will never step foot again in the United States and he will go home to the rest of his life, which is going to be living with the shunning of himself and the rest of his family because of this. He'll have a long time to think about it and he will suffer long after this sentence is done.

I thank you, Your Honor. I thank you to the government as well and to your staff. I appreciate the consideration on our sentencing memorandum, and I think that's all I wanted to say.

THE COURT: Thank you very much, Mr. Amberg.

And I did want to also indicate that I reviewed along with your memorandum all of the letters that you submitted, and they were also helpful to the Court.

And so Mr. Ramamoorthy, I would like to give you the opportunity to say whatever you would like to say on your own behalf. I would like you to speak nice and clearly into the

```
microphone so that we can hear what you're saying and it can be
 1
 2
     taken down accurately by the court reporter.
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: No, Your Honor, I don't want
 3
     to talk, I'm -- I'm not talking.
 4
              MR. AMBERG: Is it -- is it fair to say you would
 5
 6
     not -- you don't want to say anything today?
 7
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: No, yeah.
              MR. AMBERG: Okay. That was something that we
 8
 9
     discussed previously?
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yeah.
10
11
              MR. AMBERG: Okay. And you under -- you understand,
     and you have Mr. Vijay here, if you have any questions, you
12
     understand that you have -- you have a right to say whatever
13
14
     you want today and that you are choosing not to do that?
15
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yeah, yes.
16
              MR. AMBERG: And that's something we discussed?
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY:
17
                                      Yes.
18
              MR. AMBERG: Okay.
              THE COURT: All right. Well, you certainly don't
19
20
     have to say anything if you don't want to say anything, but I
21
     do want you to know that you can say whatever you would like to
22
     say at this time. You don't have to though, and I understand
23
     you're telling me you don't want to, is that right?
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yeah, okay. Thank you.
24
25
              THE COURT: All right. Okay. Very good. Well, we
```

```
will then ask Ms. Russo [sic] to go ahead on behalf of the
 1
 2
     government and make whatever arguments she wishes to make.
               MS. JAWAD:
                          Ms. Jawad, Your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT:
                           I'm sorry?
 4
               MS. JAWAD:
                           I think you confused me with April.
 5
               THE COURT:
                           Oh, I'm sorry about that.
 6
 7
               MS. JAWAD:
                           That's all right.
               THE COURT:
                           Yeah, sorry about that.
 8
 9
               MS. JAWAD:
                           It's a common...
                           Ms. Jawad. Sorry about that, Ms. Jawad,
10
               THE COURT:
11
     yeah.
                          No problem, Your Honor.
12
               MS. JAWAD:
               THE COURT: Yeah, another name that begins with A,
13
14
     Amanda Jawad, April Russo.
15
               MS. JAWAD:
                           Same unit, same type of work.
                          Forgive me.
16
               THE COURT:
               MS. JAWAD:
                          No problem.
17
               When Laura boarded that plane in January, she had no
18
     idea that her life was never going to be the same again, that
19
     she would spend the next year of her life replaying what
20
21
     happened to her over and over, and that she'd no longer be able
22
     to keep her job that requires frequent travel. Laura will
23
     carry the trauma of what Mr. Ramamoorthy did with her for the
2.4
     rest of her life.
               Now, the government's recommending a sentence of
25
```

130 months, and while this number is within the bottom half of the guidelines here, we recognize that it is a long time for someone who's never been to prison before. But this recommendation is justified not only by the nature and circumstances of the offense here, but by Mr. Ramamoorthy's conduct after the offense and continuing until this day.

But I'd like to start by first talking about the offense itself. There are few crimes more serious than a penetrative sexual assault of a woman. Sexual assault is something that robs women of their agency, of their ability to choose what or who enters their body, and the areas of Laura's body that Mr. Ramamoorthy penetrated are the most private and intimate areas that a woman has.

And this was just -- not just any sexual assault, and I think there's two things that make this more egregious than your average sexual assault, the first being that it occurred on the airplane, and the second being that the defendant was aware of, and intentionally took advantage of, Laura's mental state at the time.

Being on an airplane presents unique circumstances that exacerbate harm to the victims. They're trapped with nowhere to go, they can't move away easily and they can't call the police. In this case Laura was also cut off from all communication with the outside world. Her first instinct, if Your Honor recalls from trial, was to text her boyfriend,

someone that she felt comfortable and close with, but she couldn't get through to him. She's not able to talk to anyone, a loved one or call the police, after this happened. It's very different than being, for example, at a bar or a restaurant where if a woman, you know, gets a bad feeling from a man or notices a man paying attention to her, she can just walk away. Laura was in the window seat on this airplane.

And this is a type of crime that has been increasing in severity, as I pointed out in the government's sentencing memo, and in the past three years our office has had -- past two years our office has had three different cases of sexual assault happening on an airplane. In each of those cases and also in some of the cases that I reviewed in researching in connection with this case, the victim is always seated between the defendant and the aisle. The defendants in these cases know that the victims can't get up and leave and that's something that they take advantage of.

Mr. Ramamoorthy also took advantage of Laura's specific vulnerability at that time. Laura was not only sleeping but she had been drinking, and Mr. Ramamoorthy was aware of that. He said that many times. He knew that Laura wasn't aware enough to resist the sexual contact. He even tested the waters somewhat by starting with the upper area of her body, and as he admitted to the FBI, he first began touching her chest area and playing with her bra, and then once

```
he realized the extent to which she was sleeping, that's when he decided to go even further and violate her by going into her pants.
```

And if this is truly the first time he's done anything like this, this is a very dangerous first sexual assault to commit. You have his wife sitting on the left, and he's not only touching a victim outside of her clothes but going all the way inside of her pants to penetrate her, and these actions show deliberate conduct on his part. He made a choice to take advantages — take advantage of those circumstances and violate Laura.

I'd also like to talk about Mr. Ramamoorthy's conduct after the offense. The first thing that Mr. Ramamoorthy did after he got off the airplane was lie to the police. We saw videos during trial of what he told the officers. He pretended that he was asleep the whole time. He said twice, "I didn't intentionally touch her." And even when he sat down with the FBI, he first tried to lie to them and just said that "Laura was sleeping on me."

It wasn't until Mr. Ramamoorthy started to fully understand the extent to which the FBI knew what had happened that he began to make admissions. When -- when he realized the FBI knew that her bra was unhooked in the back, that's when Mr. Ramamoorthy started to admit that he had touched her bra and then go further to admit that he tried to put his fingers

inside of her. And even in that interview he downplays what he did because we know from Laura that he did succeed and he did put his fingers all the way inside of her and with such force that Laura woke up, was startled, and then complained of soreness to the nurse when she was examined later that day.

And then once we got to trial, he accused Laura of just imagining the whole thing and making it up.

Now, the defendant has a right to go to trial, and I'm not suggesting that the -- that the Court hold that against him, but at that trial Laura was subjected to scrutiny that victims of no other crime are subjected to. Her outfit choices were scrutinized, her drinking habits were scrutinized, even her bathroom habits were scrutinized in this courtroom. He tried to deflect the blame and attention onto her rather than accepting responsibility for what he did. And even today Mr. Ramamoorthy fails to accept responsibility for what he did. Both his sentencing memo and his attorney's allocution focus entirely on himself and the consequences that he's facing.

Now, under the United States Sentencing Guidelines
Policy Statement 5H1.1, the Court is not supposed to consider
the defendant's national origin, socio and economic status and
religion. It's been deemed not relevant by the Sentencing
Commission. But it's also important to put into perspective
that these collateral consequences that Mr. Amberg mentioned
are a result of Mr. Ramamoorthy's choices and Mr. Ramamoorthy's

```
actions. This is not something that just happened to Mr. Ramamoorthy. This is something that he did. His family and his wife are in this situation because of his choices.
```

And he's shown no remorse or concern for the victim. Other defendants in similar cases have shown — apologized for what they did in similar situations. Mr. Ramamoorthy has not. He's not expressed any kind of concern for the victim, and that's similar to what happened in the Jahagirdar case cited in the government's memo, and that's a First Circuit case from 2006. The judge in that case said that he was initially inclined to give a downward variance from the guidelines, but when the defendant failed to show any kind of remorse or concern for the victim, the judge decided to give a guideline sentence.

And not only has Mr. Ramamoorthy failed to acknowledge the harm that he caused Laura, he is not agreeing to any amount of restitution despite attempts to reach an agreement, and has been objecting to something as simple as having a dog in the courtroom.

I'd also like to address defense counsel's argument that this was an attempt and that somehow mitigates Mr. Ramamoorthy's actions. First, there's no evidence that the jury convicted Mr. Ramamoorthy based on an attempt theory versus a substantive crime. I believe the question that the jury had at trial was: is attempt a separate count or is it

included in the offense? So that doesn't tell us that the jury thought that this was an attempt.

And even if they did and even if Mr. Ramamoorthy was convicted of attempt, I don't think that makes him any less culpable. If the Court recalls in his interview with the FBI, he tells the FBI, "I tried, I was trying to put my fingers inside of her," but he kind of explained that because he was using his right hand, he wasn't as comfortable and he had a hard time getting his fingers all the way inside of her. So it's nonsensical to suggest that he should somehow get a break because the logistics of the positioning kept him from accomplishing what he intended to do, and that was to violate Laura. And again, we know from Laura's testimony that he did, in fact, succeed in doing that.

And the last factors that I would like to address are the need for just punishment and deterrence. This case has received attention nationwide and there have been similar cases after that and before it. And I think it's important to send the message to anyone who thinks about committing this type of crime that there are significant consequences more than just a slap on the wrist and being sent home. It's not fair that women have to fear that they could be assaulted just for flying on an airplane, and a guideline sentence in this case will send that message.

Your Honor, may I have a moment to consult with the

```
victim?
 1
 2
              THE COURT: You may.
               (Brief pause)
 3
              MS. JAWAD: Your Honor, the victim doesn't wish to
 4
     address the Court, but she has asked that I convey some of her
 5
     thoughts to the Court if that's all right.
 6
 7
              THE COURT:
                           Thank you.
              MS. JAWAD: So one of the things that Laura wishes
 8
 9
     the Court to know is how much her life has been impacted by
                 The defendant spoke about how his career is -- is
10
11
     going to be affected and how his job and his ability to work is
12
     affected, but -- but Laura's has as well. If Your Honor
     recalls from her testimony, she does a job that requires
13
14
     frequent travel, and she hasn't been able to do the same job
     that she was doing before. After the incident she wasn't able
15
16
     to fly and took a few months off, and in the course of that
     turned down several job opportunities that would have been
17
     fairly lucrative for her and given her exposure in her
18
     career -- career field.
19
               She did after a few months try to fly on an airplane
20
21
     and ended up having a panic attack. It was difficult for her
22
     to breathe. She felt like shortness of breath and just anxiety
23
     in connection with the whole thing. And she's also had other
     panic attacks since this happened even not in connection with
24
25
     flying on an airplane, and she didn't have those before the
```

incident.

She has difficulty sleeping sometimes. Her boyfriend sometimes finds her up at night ruminating about what happened.

Sometimes she gets stuck for days on end thinking about what happened and isn't able to go about her daily life and do the things that she did before.

She's lost interest in other activities and even work activities that she used to enjoy. She sometimes has trouble getting motivated. She didn't audition for several opportunities this year because she didn't want to travel.

And the whole thing has been very emotionally exhausting for her, and I think part of the reason is -- is really the fear that she felt in that moment. After what Mr. Ramamoorthy did, Laura sat there terrified, she didn't know what to do. She didn't know whether telling a flight attendant would cause some kind of altercation on the airplane. She didn't know whether Mr. Ramamoorthy would be angry, whether there would be some sort of scene up in the air, and -- and that really scared her. And I think that's where the feelings of anxiety and panic happened and continue to reoccur for her throughout this time, so I think this is overall something that's going to impact her for a long time.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much.

So in going over the different factors that apply,

first of all, as I said, I need to consider the nature and circumstances of the offense in this case. The offense is among the most serious kinds of offenses that our law criminalizes because it's a crime that involves an assault on another person. It is criminal Sexual Abuse that carries a penalty, a maximum penalty of up to life in prison, which is the most serious penalty other than the death penalty that applies under the law of our country, and so it's a very serious offense just in terms of the kind of offense that it is.

In terms of the facts here and what happened on a flight that was from Las Vegas on Spirit Airlines on January 3rd at the very beginning of this year, the defendant was sitting next to the victim, and according to the evidence presented in court, he did commit the crime of Sexual Abuse by digitally penetrating her and also touching her, and this was clearly a violation of this offense.

She was asleep at the time. Her own testimony was that she had been drinking and as a result she was very sleepy and fell into a deep sleep, and so at that point she was not in a position to object or perhaps even understand what was going on because she was unconscious.

And so once the activity was so significant that it awakened the victim, she did begin to text, try to text to her boyfriend, that was part of the proof. She expressed her

```
emotion, her outrage, her fear as to what had happened and determined that she needed to tell someone right away, so she went to the flight attendants and told the flight attendants and they re-seated her.
```

Her clothing was unbuttoned, her pants were unbuttoned. She appeared to be upset and disheveled. All that was presented during the course of the trial.

Also during the trial the statement that Mr.

Ramamoorthy gave to the FBI, segments of that statement were presented and the Court viewed those statements. Ms. Jawad on behalf of the government mentioned that portion of Mr.

Ramamoorthy's statement to the FBI agents where he said, "I tried," and I do recall that as part of the statement that Mr.

Ramamoorthy made. That was in reference to saying that he tried to put his finger into the pants and — of the victim.

And that was clearly part of the proof that was before the jury

Since we're talking about the nature of the offense and part of the argument that counsel has made on behalf of Mr. Ramamoorthy relates to the issue of whether this could more properly be considered an attempt, I want to address that simply by saying, first of all, as I think all counsel has recognized, that distinction doesn't matter for this offense because this offense includes within it "to attempt to commit

in this case, and the jury found beyond a reasonable doubt that

Mr. Ramamoorthy had committed this offense.

```
criminal Sexual Abuse." If you attempt to commit criminal Sexual Abuse, you violate this same statute that the defendant was convicted of.
```

Now, there was -- there was a question from the jury in this case, and we went over that at the time of the trial and the parties had a chance to know what that question was and we fashioned a response for the jury. That question was -- and I have it right here. It said, "Are there two charges under consideration, i.e., one, Sexual Abuse, two, Attempted Sexual Abuse?" Question mark, there are three question marks. And then it said, "The verdict form only includes Sexual Abuse. Please clarify."

And we responded. I won't read the entire response, but we responded to the jury. I say we because I prepared a proposed response to the jury and I read that to counsel and then we delivered it in open court to the jury, which essentially said that the charge of Sexual Abuse includes both Sexual Abuse and Attempted Sexual Abuse. And then we referenced the different jury instructions that set out the elements for Sexual Abuse and the elements for Attempted Sexual Abuse and the jury instruction that indicated that the jurors needed to find that the defendant committed this act unanimously in one of these two ways.

And so that is the issue of attempt here. It's not really knowable to the Court or to anyone which manner the jury

considered the evidence here, but there's no question that they were properly instructed as to the law and they reached a unanimous verdict that the defendant had violated this statute.

So that is the type of offense that we have here and it is an extremely serious offense.

I also want to mention that the statute does include within it the requirement that the person who is being victimized is "incapable of appraising the nature of the conduct or physically incapable of declining to participate in, or communicating unwillingness to engage in, the sexual act," and that was certainly the case here. That was part of the proof here and it's part of the reason why the offense is a very serious offense.

In terms of the history and characteristics of the individual defendant, I've looked over the Pre-Sentence Report carefully regarding this, and Mr. Ramamoorthy up until this point has lived a lawful-abiding life, a law-abiding life. He has attained an education while he was in India. He received a bachelor's degree in -- in technology. He was able to successfully complete several different jobs while he was in India after attaining his degree and then was able to obtain a position in the United States, came over to the United States and worked here, again in a law-abiding manner. He was married and brought his wife here as well, and since June of 2015 was working here in the United States without causing any problems

to anyone.

All of these things are factors that weigh in favor of Mr. Ramamoorthy because it shows that he has, as I say, lived a law-abiding life up until this time, and I do weigh those in his favor.

I did read the different letters of support that corroborate this conclusion about his good character up until now. There were many statements of support for him and indications of people who believed that he had a good character, and so part of what makes this case somewhat hard to understand is that fact. You have an individual who up until now has not really done anything illegal, has not harmed anyone, has not ever been in prison or been arrested, and yet now is facing such serious consequences for his conduct.

And so those are the two first factors that I need to consider as far as the seriousness of the offense and the history and characteristics of the individual person.

In terms of deterrence, there is a concern for deterrence here because this kind of activity is so serious and so harmful to the victim that a serious penalty is necessary to make certain that both the individual, in this case Mr. Ramamoorthy, but also that society as a whole recognizes that this kind of behavior carries very onerous, difficult consequences for anyone who would engage in that kind of conduct, and that protecting victims from this kind of conduct

is extremely important to society, and so there is a need under deterrence to impose a significant penalty.

In terms of protecting the public, there is also a need to protect the public, but it's not as much of a need because of the fact both that up until now, as I said, the defendant had not committed any conduct like this, but also because he does face deportation, and so any protection of the public would be accomplished by his being removed from the United States. That would protect the public in the United States.

But the other issue the Court has to consider is the need to impose a just punishment and a punishment that promotes respect for law. A just punishment here, as I said, does need to be a serious punishment. The crime is a crime that harmed another human being in a very serious way. And I have certainly considered and am considering the statements that Ms. Jawad placed on the record that were the statements and concerns of the victim in this case, and I weigh that very seriously in determining a sentence that would be promoting respect for law and providing for a just punishment.

The government is seeking a sentence that is in the mid-point of the guideline range, which is 130 months. Now, 130 months is a very lengthy sentence. I don't think that a sentence of 130 months is necessary in this case because I think that is greater than necessary to accomplish these goals

that I've described. That's nearly 11 years.

And I need to consider both what I might call aggravating and mitigating circumstances here in this case. Among the aggravating circumstances are some that I've already mentioned: the fact that the victim was asleep and intoxicated, unable to in any way respond, and so she was a vulnerable victim; the fact that the defendant's wife was present at the time is of concern; the fact that Mr. Ramamoorthy did not tell the whole truth to the FBI when he was interviewed.

Further, in reviewing Mr. Ramamoorthy's statements, it appeared that he was attempting in some ways to place the blame on the victim by referring to how she was dressed and the fact that she was — appeared to be drunk to him. Those statements were of concern. He did essentially admit the offense when he talked to the FBI eventually by admitting that he tried to commit this offense and that's attempt.

I am concerned that there is no -- no expression of remorse here, no real concern by Mr. Ramamoorthy for the victim. I'm not going to give that too much weight here because the defendant has the right to remain silent. He's chosen to remain silent, that's his right, and he can't be forced to say anything and I certainly am not forcing him to say anything.

The -- on the mitigating side here, as I said before, Mr. Ramamoorthy has no criminal record whatsoever. He's led a

productive and law-abiding life up until this point. He's been an educated person, a professional. He's had employment, he's maintained employment. He's been supportive to his wife and his family.

I am concerned about what Mr. Amberg said regarding his having been assaulted in prison. That is completely unacceptable and under no circumstances should that ever be permitted, and I will contact and make certain that wherever he is designated, every effort is made to ensure his safety.

With regard to the issue I mentioned before about whether the facts of the case were more consistent with an attempt than with a fully completed crime, I give that some weight here but not very much weight. The reason I give it some weight is because there was a question from the juror about that and I'm not going to disregard that; that is part of the record in this case. But as I said previously, attempt is part of this offense, and so an attempt is still a violation of this statute.

I have also listened to what Mr. Amberg indicated about the potential consequence of shunning or mistreatment of Mr. Ramamoorthy's family or himself in India, which Mr. Amberg has described as severe and lifelong. That may well be a difficult consequence of this offense and this conviction and this sentence. I'm not certain what difference it would make in that consequence regardless of how long the sentence may be.

The question for the Court is whether there is a basis for any variance from the guideline range under these different factors that I've gone through here. The guideline range is — that the parties have agreed to here is 121 to 151 months.

And given the fact that there are both significant aggravating circumstances but also a number of mitigating circumstances that I've gone through here, in some ways there is a balance between the two. I do believe that a very serious sentence is appropriate here. It should be a sentence that is sufficient to accomplish all these goals that I've described, but it shouldn't be greater than necessary to accomplish all these goals.

I've thought very hard about what this sentence should be, and as I said, I think it should be a very serious sentence and a sentence that is grave enough to send a message that these kinds of activities are not to be committed and that anyone who does commit them will have to weigh the consequences of on a very significant penalty.

Having considered all of these factors, I believe that in this case a sentence of 108 months is sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish all the goals of sentencing. That represents a small variance from the bottom of the guideline range, and I believe that that's justified for the reasons that I've described as mitigating factors here. I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
won't go through them all again, but I believe that it's
necessary that the sentence be lengthy in order to provide for
an appropriate deterrent.
         That is the sentence that I intend to impose.
are a number of additional conditions, including supervised
         But before I impose sentence, I want to ask both
parties if they have any objections they wish to place on the
record.
         MR. AMBERG: No, Your Honor, for Mr. Ramamoorthy.
         MS. JAWAD:
                    No objection, Your Honor.
         THE COURT:
                     Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of
1984, the Court, considering the sentencing guidelines and
factors of 18 U.S. Code, Section 3353(a), hereby commits the
defendant, Prabhu Ramamoorthy, to the custody of the Bureau of
Prisons for a term of 108 months.
         It is further recommended that the defendant be
designated to an institution with a comprehensive sexual
offender treatment program.
         Upon release from imprisonment, the defendant shall
be placed on supervised release for a term of five years.
         It is further ordered Mr. Ramamoorthy pay a special
assessment of $100, which will be due immediately, and a
Justice for Victims Trafficking Act, or JVTA, assessment of
$5,000.
         The Court waives the imposition of a fine, costs of
```

incarceration and costs of supervision due to the defendant's lack of financial resources.

While in custody, the defendant shall participate in the Inmate Financial Responsibility Program or IFRP. The Court is aware of the requirements of the IFRP and -- and approves the payment schedules of this program and hereby orders the defendant's compliance.

The mandatory drug testing condition is suspended based on the Court's determination that defendant poses a low risk of future substance abuse.

While on supervision, the defendant shall abide by the standard conditions as adopted by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan and shall comply with the following special conditions:

Due to the nature and circumstances of the instant offense, the following special conditions are ordered:

Number one, the defendant shall comply with the requirements of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act as directed by the probation officer, the Bureau of Prisons or any state sex offender registration agency in which he resides, works, is a student, or was convicted of a qualifying offense.

The defendant shall successfully complete any sex offender diagnostic evaluations, treatment or counseling programs as directed by the probation officer. Reports

pertaining to sex offender assessments and treatment shall be provided to the probation officer. Based on the defendant's ability to pay, the defendant shall pay the cost of diagnostic evaluations, treatment or counseling programs in an amount determined by the probation officer.

Number three, the defendant shall be required to submit to periodic polygraph testing at the discretion of the probation officer as a means to ensure compliance with the requirements of supervision or treatment. No violation proceedings will arise solely on the results of a polygraph examination. Based on the defendant's ability to pay, the defendant shall pay the cost of polygraph examinations in an amount determined by the probation officer.

Number four, the defendant shall not associate with minor children under the age of 18, except in the presence of a responsible adult who is aware of the nature of his background and the current offense, without prior approval of the probation officer. The defendant may have unsupervised contact with any of his own children at the discretion of the probation officer, if he should have children. The defendant shall not frequent places where children congregate on a regular basis such as, but not limited to, school grounds, playgrounds, child toy stores, video arcades, et cetera.

Number five, defendant shall notify anyone that he may date or marry with a minor child under the age of 18 of his

conviction.

Number six, the defendant shall not purchase, sell, view or possess images in any form of media or live venue that depict pornography, sexually explicit conduct, child erotica or child nudity. The defendant shall not patronize any place where such material or entertainment is available.

Number seven, the defendant shall have employment pre-approved by the Probation Department. The defendant shall not be employed at or participate in any volunteer activities that involve contact with minors under the age of 18 or adults with disabilities without prior approval of the probation officer.

Number eight, the defendant shall have all residences pre-approved by the Probation Department. The defendant shall not provide care or live in a residence where children under the age of 18 or adults with disabilities also reside without prior approval of the probation officer.

Number nine, the defendant shall participate in the Computer/Internet Monitoring Program administered by the U.S. Probation Department. The defendant shall abide by this program agreement in effect at the time of supervision and shall comply with any amendments to the program during the term of supervision. Due to the advances in technology that may occur, the Court will adopt the amendments to this program as necessary. For the purpose of accounting for all computers,

hardware, software and accessories, the defendant shall submit his residence, person, computer and/or vehicle to a search conducted by the U.S. Probation Department at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner. The defendant shall inform any other residents that any premises where he is living may be subject to a search pursuant to this condition. The defendant shall provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information, including billing records for telephone, cable, Internet or satellite.

Number ten, the defendant shall submit his person, residence, office, vehicles, papers, business or place of employment and any property under his control to a search. Such a search shall be conducted by a U.S. probation officer at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner based upon a reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a violation of a condition of release. Failure to submit to such a search may be grounds for revocation. The defendant shall warn any residents that the premises may be subject to searches.

Number 11, the defendant shall not have contact, directly or indirectly, with any victim or witness in this instant offense unless approved by the probation officer.

Number 12, the defendant shall not own or possess a camera, photographic device and/or equipment, including video recording equipment, without prior approval of the probation officer.

The defendant shall not incur any new credit charges or open any additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless the defendant is in compliance with any payment schedule. That's number 13.

Number 14, the defendant shall provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information.

And number 15, the defendant shall make monthly installment payments on any remaining balance of any fine or special assessment at a rate or schedule recommended by the Probation Department and approved by the Court.

That is the sentence of the Court. Mr. Ramamoorthy, you do have the right to appeal this conviction and this sentence. If you intend to appeal this conviction and this sentence, you would need to do so within 14 days of the date that the judgment is issued, the written judgment. Do you understand that?

DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Is there any objection or any other matter that either party wishes to place on the record?

MR. AMBERG: Just one, Your Honor. I don't know where exactly he would go, but there -- is there any chance that Your Honor could recommend like the Texas region? His brother lives down there. I think for purposes of his family visiting would be a lot easier down there than somewhere, you know, up here.

```
Do you have any particular institution in
 1
              THE COURT:
     mind?
 2
              MR. AMBERG: I don't, but now that I know the
 3
     sentence, I could probably go back and -- and look at it and
 4
     see what's around. I assume there's gotta be something down
 5
     there that meets the requirement.
 6
 7
              THE COURT:
                          Well, I do recommend that Mr. Ramamoorthy
     be designated to a federal correctional institution in the
 8
 9
     state of Texas. That is a large state. Is there a particular
     region or city area you're talking about.
10
11
              MR. AMBERG: Where's your brother live?
              DEFENDANT RAMAMOORTHY: Austin.
12
              MR. AMBERG: Austin? Austin if it's possible, Your
13
14
     Honor.
15
              THE COURT: So somewhere in the Austin, Texas region?
16
     I'd be happy to recommend that. If you have a particular
     institution in mind and you notify us within the next 24 hours,
17
18
     we will try to put that in the judgment.
              MR. AMBERG: Thank you, Your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: Anything -- anything on behalf of the
20
21
     government?
                          Yes, Your Honor. There is the issue of
22
              MS. JAWAD:
23
     restitution. The parties were not able to come to an agreement
     with respect to the numbers, so we ask that the Court set a
24
25
     date at which we can set the amount of the victim's losses.
```

```
THE COURT:
                         Would that not be then included within
 1
     the judgment?
 2
              MS. JAWAD:
                         So the judgment can be left open for up
 3
     to 90 days for the issue of restitution, so hopefully sooner
 4
 5
     than 90 days this can be worked out, but basically the judgment
     would remain open until this is resolved.
 6
 7
              THE COURT:
                          So you're saying we would not issue the
 8
     judgment until the restitution is determined?
 9
              MS. JAWAD:
                          That's correct.
              THE COURT: Well, we'll try to do that quickly.
10
11
     long is that going to take?
12
              MR. AMBERG: Your Honor, we're still in the process
     of discussing restitution. I'm not convinced that we will
13
     ultimately have a restitution hearing. I'm going to see Mr.
14
     Ramamoorthy next week after which the dust, you know, sort of
15
16
     settles I guess is a good way to put it, and then we're going
     to discuss it again. We've discussed it before, the issue of
17
18
     restitution, and we may be able to resolve it. I know that the
     government has been trying to resolve it as well.
19
                                                        So I don't
     want to wait too long for the hearing, but at the same time I
20
21
     don't want to -- if this is something that we can resolve --
22
     and I still think we might be able to. We haven't been able to
23
     do it yet. I know they've tried. But like I said, I think
24
     that maybe let's see what happens next Friday when I see him.
25
              THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll determine what to
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
It could be that we could issue the judgment and amend it
do.
later with the order of restitution if that's another way to do
it. Would that be a good way to go?
         MR. AMBERG: I mean if that...
                     Yes, Your Honor, that's fine with me.
         MS. JAWAD:
It's -- it's 18 USC 3664(d)(5) that provides the final
determination can be made up to 90 days after the sentencing.
         THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. Is --
yes, go ahead.
                      I apologize, I apologize, Your Honor.
         MR. AMBERG:
do -- because it does concern when his Notice of Appeal should
be filed. I think if we do it -- is that the way that we're
going to do it where the judgment will be entered and we'll
just amend it later with the restitution amount? Because then
I think that would kick in his need to do this immediately, to
file that 14 -- within 14 days claim of appeal. So I just want
to make sure I know that because I'm going to go do that and
then that way he's protected.
         MS. SMITH: Your Honor, if I may address this issue
                It's really kind of a procedural problem.
of restitution.
                                                            Ιf
you issue a judgment, then the rules say that an amended
judgment can only be filed under certain circumstances within
14 days of the initial judgment being entered. It also is
going to affect his time to file a Notice of Appeal. And if we
issue a judgment and then issue an amended judgment with
```

restitution, it's going to affect the way that the Court of Appeals is going to docket the case.

The cleanest way I think is to perhaps give us until next Friday to communicate with the Court. If we've resolved the issue, then you're only holding the judgment open for a period of a week and a half. But there — there — there is kind of a procedural posture if you enter a judgment in the next day or so and then try to enter another one 30 days from now. The rules allow you to hold it open until the issue of restitution is resolved.

THE COURT: Is there any impediment, any legal impediment to issuing the judgment several weeks after the sentence is imposed in open court?

MS. SMITH: Not under these circumstances when you have a restitution request, as long as the Court is aware that the restitution matter is pending.

THE COURT: All right. Well, this isn't my preference because I think it's much better to have a judgment issued as soon after the sentence is pronounced in open court as possible, and so really this should have been resolved, you all should have gotten this resolved before now. But I would say that we would want to try to issue this by no later than let's say January 4th. Can you get it resolved by then?

MR. AMBERG: Judge, I think it's going to be resolved next Friday. And I would say, Your Honor, that the government

```
did -- they did approach me, it wasn't yesterday or anything
 1
 2
     like that, it was a while ago, and we've gone over it trying to
     figure something out. So I -- this is something that we have
 3
     had a negotiation back and forth, but, you know, it's -- it
 4
     was -- bringing it up yesterday was very difficult to talk that
 5
     with him with the gravity of what's going on. I think next
 6
     week it'll be easier, now that we know what's happened here,
 7
 8
     to -- to probably finalize that restitution. So I think next
 9
     Friday. I'll contact the Court if -- as soon as I hear from
     Mr. Ramamoorthy.
10
11
              THE COURT: All right. Well, I'm just looking, so
     for either the next -- the first Friday in January is
12
     January 4th and the next one is January 11th, so it's really no
13
     later than by January 11th, all right? Let's get this resolved
14
     as soon as we can.
15
16
              Is there anything else?
                         Not from the government, Your Honor.
17
              MS. JAWAD:
              MR. AMBERG: No, Your Honor, from Mr. Ramamoorthy.
18
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you very much. We can
19
20
     be adjourned in this matter.
21
                          Thank you, Your Honor.
              MS. JAWAD:
              THE CLERK: Please rise. Court is in recess.
22
23
               (Court in recess at 2:42 p.m.)
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION 1 2 I, Linda M. Cavanagh, Official Court Reporter of the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, 3 appointed pursuant to the provisions of Title 28, United States 4 Code, Section 753, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages 1 5 through 53 comprise a full, true and correct transcript of the 6 7 proceedings held in the matter of United States of America vs. 8 Prabhu Ramamoorthy, Case No. 18-20027, on Thursday, December 9 13, 2018. 10 11 12 s/Linda M. Cavanagh Linda M. Cavanagh, RDR, RMR, CRR, CRC Federal Official Court Reporter 13 United States District Court 14 Eastern District of Michigan 15 16 Date: March 4, 2019 17 Detroit, Michigan 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25